Notice of Ex Parte Contact

TO:

Data Center

All Parties in Case No. ER-2007-0002

FROM:

Chairman Jeff Davis My

DATE:

March 14, 2007



I received the attached letters dated March 9, 2007 and March 13, 2007 from Mr. Edward R. Martin, Jr. regarding Ameren. The Commission is currently considering some of the issues discussed in this document in case **ER-2007-0002** which is a contested case. In contested cases, the Commission is bound by the same *ex parte* rule as a court of law.

Although communications from members of the public and other government officials are always welcome, those communications must be made known to all parties to a contested case so that those parties have the opportunity to respond. According to the Commission's rules (4 CSR 240-4.020(8)), when a communication (either oral or written) occurs outside the hearing process, any member of the Commission or Regulatory Law Judge who received the communication shall prepare a written report concerning the communication and submit it to each member of the Commission and the parties to the case. The report shall identify the person(s) who participated in the *ex parte* communication, the circumstances which resulted in the communication, the substance of the communication, and the relationship of the communication to a particular matter at issue before the Commission.

Therefore, I submit this report pursuant to the rules cited above. This will ensure that any party to this case will have notice of the attached information and a full and fair opportunity to respond to the comments contained therein.

cc:

Commissioners Executive Director Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge General Counsel



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR STATE OF MISSOURI JEFFERSON CITY 65101

MATT BLUNT

STATE CAPITOL ROOM 2+6 (573) 751-3222

March 9, 2007

Mr. Jeff Davis Chairman Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dear Chairman Davis:

I neglected to include in my recent letter one other concern that I have regarding Ameren's rate case.

My concern is this: were ratepayers of Ameren being forced to pay for the inappropriate campaign contributions made by Steve Sullivan and Ameren to Attorney General Nixon? If Ameren wrote the checks to pay Mr. Nixon's campaign from general revenue of Ameren, then the rate payers were footing the bill. This is wrong and is not a cost that the ratepayers should pay. To clarify Ameren's policy and to protect the ratepayers, the Public Service Commission should ask Mr. Sullivan or Ameren's treasurer about the contributions and from what funds they were drawn. The public deserves to know what Ameren is doing with the money customers pay.

Thank you for your time with this. Sorry for the oversight in my previous letter. Please share this with your colleagues on the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

Ed Mutin Edward R. Martin, Jr.

Chief of Staff



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR STATE OF MISSOURI JEFFERSON CITY 65101

MATT BLUNT

STATE CAPITOL ROOM 216 (573) 751-3222

March 13, 2007

Mr. Tom Voss President and Chief Executive Ameren UE One Ameren Avenue 1901 Cheuteau Avenue P.O. Box 66149, MC08 St. Louis, MO 63166-6149

Dear Mr. Voss:

It was a pleasure to meet you last month when you came by my office to introduce yourself as the new president of Ameren as of December 2006. I was glad to hear about your role and that you were striving to set a good tone for Ameren – you stated your hope to work with honesty and clear communication. As I have said to you then and again now: you have a lot of work to do to bring Ameren back from the damage to its reputation over the past year or so.

I was surprised – and a bit troubled – to hear your comments to the press after your testimony before the Commerce, Energy and the Environment Committee of the Missouri Senate last Thursday, March 8, 2007. Your comments seemed to betray a lack of basic understanding about the facts surrounding Ameren's interaction with the state of Missouri in general and Attorney General Jay Nixon in particular.

In case your staff or colleagues are not sufficiently informing you, allow me to reiterate what has occurred. Starting last year, your company has been put under intense and inappropriate pressure by the criminal prosecutor in the Taum Sauk matter, Attorney General Jay Nixon. Your own colleagues have told me this repeatedly – especially and specifically Steve Sullivan on September 11, 2006. Steve made clear that the Attorney General sought contributions from Ameren that would be funneled through state committees to the Attorney General's campaign. Ameren complied with this inappropriate (and perhaps illegal) request. Later, Ameren continued to fear the Attorney General's actions regarding a criminal case. These fears continue today and have forced Ameren to cease settlement negotiations with the state.

Mr. Thomas R. Voss March 13, 2007 Page 2

Regarding your comments that the Missouri Ethics Commission has dealt definitively with the matter of the Attorney General's inappropriate request for funneled campaign contributions from Ameren, I must politely disagree and point to a certain fact that your staff or colleagues may not have told you. That fact is that the Missouri Ethics Commission has not (yet) taken the testimony of Steve Sullivan (under oath) regarding the Attorney General's solicitation of funneled contributions. As you know (or should know), it is my understanding that Drue Duncan, an Ameren government relations specialist, testified before the Missouri Ethics Commission not Steve Sullivan. Until Steve Sullivan testifies, the matter cannot be said to be definitively resolved. In light of all of this, I again ask you to step forward and deal with the state of Missouri honestly. You should direct Steve Sullivan to testify quickly in whatever form best serves him and Ameren – the PSC, the Senate, to government officials – to get his story out.

Please understand that Ameren cannot adequately plead its case for a rate increase without first coming clean regarding what has happened: 1) with Jay Nixon; 2) with the Taum Sauk settlement and an initial attempt to charge ratepayers \$10 million for the disaster; 3) regarding the funneled contributions that may or may not have come from Ameren general funds (at ratepayer costs); and 4) other credibility issues surrounding Steve Sullivan.

I understand that your testimony last Thursday, March 15, 2007 was interrupted and will be continued this Thursday, March 22, 2007. During your testimony this week, please help Missourians get a better sense of what is going on with Ameren. Tom, if you, Ameren, or Steve Sullivan are so intimidated by the Attorney General, you should seek protection from the appropriate officials.

Please feel free to call upon me again when you come to Jefferson City.

Sincerely yours,

Edward R. Martin, Jr.

cc: Senator Kevin Engler (for the Commerce, Energy and Environment Committee of the Missouri Senate)

Chairman Jeff Davis, Public Service Commission (for the Commission)